

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 714 of 1996

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE K.R.VYAS

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements?
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not?
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement?
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge?

-----  
RAISINH BABHAI GOHIL

Versus

POLICE COMMISSIONER

-----  
Appearance:

MR SUNIL C PATEL, Advocate for the Petitioner.

MR.U.R.BHATT,AGP,for the Respondents.

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE K.R.VYAS

Date of decision: 03/07/96

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Petitioner Raisinh Babhai Gohil ( hereinafter referred to as "the detenu" ), by way of this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, has challenged the order of detention dated 11-1-1996 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Rajkot City, ( hereinafter referred to as "the detaining authority" ) under section 3 (1) of the Gujarat Prevention of Anti Social Activities

Act, 1985 ( hereinafter referred to as " the PASA Act" ).

In the grounds of detention supplied to the detenu, the detaining authority has placed reliance on five criminal cases for various offences punishable under the Indian Penal Code and the Bombay Police Act . These cases are pending trial. The detaining authority has also placed reliance on the statements of three witnesses for the alleged incidents of 7-11-95, 23-9-95 and 12-10-95 and recorded a finding that the petitioner is a dangerous person within the meaning of section 2 (c) of the PASA Act and with a view to preventing the detenu from acting in any manner prejudicial to the maintenance of public order, it was necessary to pass the order of detention against him and, therefore, the impugned order is passed, which is under challenge in the present petition.

This petition is capable of being disposed of on the first contention advanced by Mr. Sunil C.Patel . Therefore, it is not necessary to refer to and deal with the other contentions advanced by him. He contended that the cases registered against the detenu are yet to be proved against the detenu. Assuming that the allegations made in the grounds of detention are true, in that event also, at the most the detenu can be held responsible for committing breach of the law and order and under no circumstances he can be held responsible for the breach of public order. Under the circumstances, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority that with a view to maintaining public order the detention of the detenu is necessary is not genuine and, therefore, the impugned order of detention is illegal and void.

I find considerable substance in the submission of Mr.Patel. All the cases registered against the detenu are of individual disputes and the public in general is not concerned at all. Therefore, there is no question of the breach of maintenance of public order. Even, considering the statements of the witnesses relied upon by the detaining authority, in my opinion, they are vague and general and , therefore, in absence of any cogent material against the detenu, the subjective satisfaction arrived at by the detaining authority for the purpose of passing the order of detention against the detenu is not genuine.

In the result, this petition is allowed. The impugned order of detention dated 11-1-1996 is quashed and set aside. The detenu Raisinh Babhai Gohil is

directed to be set at liberty forthwith if his detention  
is not required for any other purpose. Rule is made  
absolute accordingly with no order as to costs.

o-o-o-o-o-o

True copy